

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 of the present application remain pending. Claims 1-3, and 6-28 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the Claim amendments.

DRAWINGS

The specification has been amended to correct elements which were mis-numbered in the specification. Specifically, computer system 110 (page 19, line 22 and page 20, line 9) and Program A 601a (page 27, line 16) have been re-numbered in the specification. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the objections under 37 CFR 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

Figure 7 and Figure 8 are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(5) because the following reference character(s) are not mentioned in the description: 105a of Figure 7, and 105b of Figure 8 are not found in the specification. The specification has been amended to include the reference characters which were not mentioned. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the objections under 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(5) be withdrawn.

SPECIFICATION

The Abstract is objected to for exceeding 150 words. The Abstract is amended herein to comply with the 150 word limit. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 28 is objected to for referring to a method rather than a system. Claim 28 is amended herein and now refers to a system. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to Claim 28.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 13-14 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention due to a lack of antecedent basis. Claims 13-14 and 22-23 are amended herein to correct the informality. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 13-14 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 8, 19, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,711), hereinafter referred to as "Song," in view of Bodin et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,762), hereinafter referred to as "Bodin." The Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not rendered obvious by Song alone or in combination with Bodin. Claim 1 of the present invention recites:

In a handheld electronic device having a plurality of installed programs, a method of switching between said plurality of programs, comprising:

- a) determining a jump program from said plurality of installed programs;
- b) storing a program state of a currently running program into a context packet;
- c) releasing temporary memory used by said currently running program; and
- d) calling said jump program; and
- e) suspending execution of said currently running program.

Claims 10 and 19 recite similar claim limitations. The Applicants respectfully submit that Song does not teach or suggest switching between a plurality of programs installed on a handheld electronic device as recited in Claim 1. Instead, Song teaches away from the present invention as claimed by teaching that context switching is performed by a multimedia multiprocessor system 100. The Applicants respectfully submit that the context switching taught by Song requires a multitasking operating system and is thus incompatible with a handheld electronic device as claimed which does not use a multitasking operating system. Song further

teaches in column 3, lines 23-41 that a typical host processor 102 is an x86 processor such as an Intel Corporation Pentium™ or Pentium Pro™ processor comprising a host processor 102 which communicates with a multimedia signal processor 200 via a PC chipset 107. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the teaching of Song is clearly directed to desktop computer architectures and therefore, teaches away from the recited claim limitation of Claim 1 of a handheld electronic device.

The Applicants further submit that Song does not teach or suggest suspension of the currently running program when switching between a plurality of programs as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, because Song teaches a multitasking operating system and computer architecture, there is no advantage to suspending the currently running program in the claimed fashion. However, in present invention, suspending the currently running program is advantageous because multitasking operating systems are not typically used in a handheld electronic device.

Furthermore, the teaching of Song relies upon markers interspersed by a programmer throughout the application program which is used as a conditional context switch (column 8, lines 46-60). The Applicants respectfully submit that the requirement of markers embedded throughout the application program code further

teaches away from the recited claim limitations as recited in Claim 1 of the present invention.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed because the Applicants respectfully submit that Bodin fails to overcome the shortcomings of Song. Specifically, Bodin does not teach or suggest a handheld electronic device as recited in Claim 1 of the present invention. Instead, Bodin teaches a method and apparatus which are directed toward transferring data between an application running in virtual mode and an adapter having a microprocessor capable of memory address (column 2, lines 20-24). Bodin further teaches in column 4, lines 57-68 the use of the Intel 80486 microprocessor.

Furthermore, the method and apparatus of Bodin is directed toward virtualizing a DOS environment to support adapters or peripheral devices to access memory resources anywhere in the system space independently of the host microprocessor. Bodin also teaches that the method and apparatus are applicable to any other operating system that may be virtualized. The Applicants respectfully submit that this teaches away from the recited claim limitation of a handheld electronic device recited in Claims 1, 10, and 19 of the present invention. As described above, the limited resources of a handheld electronic device typically is not capable of supporting a multitasking operating system. However, the system and

apparatus of Bodin is clearly directed toward a multitasking operating system on a desktop platform.

Additionally, Bodin does not teach or suggest that the currently running program is suspended when memory is released as recited in Claims 1, 10, and 19 of the present invention.

Therefore, a combination of Song and Bodin results in an apparatus which requires a multitasking operating system operable on a desktop platform, thus teaching away from a handheld electronic device as recited in Claims 1, 10, and 19 of the present invention. Furthermore, the combination of Song and Bodin does not teach or suggest suspending the currently running program as recited in Claims 1, 10, and 19 of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 1, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 11-18 depend from Claim 10 and recite additional claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 20-28 depend from Claim 19 and recite additional claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 20-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-18, 20, 22-25, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song and Bodin and further in view of Siitonen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,796), hereinafter referred to as "Siitonen." The Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not rendered obvious by Song alone or in combination with Bodin and/or Siitonen.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Siitonen fails to overcome the shortcomings of Song and Bodin. Specifically, Siitonen fails to teach or suggest suspending a currently running program when calling a jump program as recited in Claims 1, 10, and 19 of the present invention. Furthermore, the apparatus of Siitonen is incompatible with the system and apparatus of either Song or Bodin. As

described above, handheld electronic devices typically do not offer the resources required to use a multitasking operating system. Therefore, the method and apparatus of Song and/or Bodin are incompatible with the personal digital assistant of Siitonen. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 2, 4-7, 9-18, 20, 22-25, and 27-28 are not rendered obvious by Song alone or in combination with Bodin and/or Siitonen. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 2, 4-7, 9-18, 20, 22-25, and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.



CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-28 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date:

12/13/2007



Anthony C. Murabito

Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060